1: Roth--47-48 (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 201, 609, 721

"Backhouse mentions that under circumstances of rage among this people it is common for them to seize a stick and brandish it about (p. 103). During the war they naturally became vindictive. Desperate characters, who have absconded into the woods, have no doubt committed the greatest outrages upon the Natives, and these ignorant beings, incapable of discrimination, are now filled with enmity and revenge against the whole body of white inhabitants' (Colonel Arthur, Colonies and Slaves, Van Diemen's Land, p. 5). A Government Order says: 'It is evident, from the [48] hostile spirit of the natives, and from the cunning which seems common to all savages, that they are not to be approached without some personal danger (ibid. p. 34), and for such behaviour as this no one can reasonably blame them.'"

1: Roth--49 [2] (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 177, 721

"They also improved in the art of war during their last struggle for existence (Arthur, Colonies and Slaves, Van Diemen's Land, pp. 22-23): 'The aborigines have during a considerable period of time evinced a grwoing spirit of hatred, outrage, and enmity, against the subjects of His Majesty, and are putting in practice modes of hostility, indicating gradual, though slow advances in art, system, and method.' Laplace (III. ch. xviii. p. 197) gives similar testimony: 'These islanders, whom the first European navigators described to us, as men whose intellectual faculties were hardly superior to the instinct of animals, have changed greatly; for to-day, when excited by the thirst for vengeance or for piliage, they show such an intelligence, such a craftiness, that the colonists, whose dwellings lie farthest back at the edge of the forests, among whom fear engenders superstition, believe them sorcerers.' Considering the above, it may be questioned whether Dove's statement (p. 251) is not a little too severe."

"Péron, who was the next explorer, did not, however, find them [58] so amiable. While the surprise of one of the women on seeing a sailor take off his fur glove caused the party to laugh heartily, a native stole a bottle of arrack. 'As this contained a large portion of our drink, we were obliged to make him return it, at which he seemed to feel some resentment, for he was not slow in departing with his family, in spite of all I could do to retain him longer' (ch. xii. p. 224). The probable result of this little contretemps is described by him thus (pp. 235-236): 'On my return I found that the little yawl of the "Géographe" having gone to fish on Bruny Island, the aborigines had appeared in large numbers; that, loaded with presents by our companions, they had passed the greater part of the day amongst them; that M. Maurouard, one of our midshipmen, had proposed to one amongst them who appeared the most robust, to wrestle with him, and that the Van Diemen's Lander had accepted the challenge; was several times thrown by the French middy, and obliged to acknowledge his inferiority; that from that moment until their departure several hours had elapsed, without any signs being shown that the confidence and friendship of the aborigines had been weakened or altered, and that, loaded with presents by our friends, even at the moment when the latter were re-embarking, it was impossible to conceive the slightest suspicion of their intentions, when, all of a sudden, a long spear, thrown from behind some neighbouring rocks, struck M. Maurouard in the shoulder; that this rude weapon had been thrown with such force, that, after slipping along the whole

surface of the shoulder-blade, it opened a passage through the flesh of the shoulder and of the neck. The crew of the yawl, indignant at this perfidious cowardice and savageness, had wished to pursue the savages in vengeance, but they had already disappeared among the rocks and brushwood.'"

116, 177, 721

"During the war of extermination a good deal of evidence was collected regarding the attitude of the aborigines towards the white settlers, and it is not astonishing to find that, with a few exceptions, the Tasmanians are condemned as treacherous, aggressive, ungrateful and cruel. The following extracts confirm this statement: 'We are undoubtedly the first aggressors, and the desperate characters amongst the prisoner population, who have, from time to time, absconded into the woods, have no doubt committed the greatest outrages upon the natives, and these ignorant beings, incapable of discrimination, are now filled with [61] enmity and revenge against the whole body of white inhabitants.(Colonel Governor Arthur, Colonies and Slaves, Van Diemen's Land, p. 5). Another account says: 'Even the inhabitants of the settled districts were insecure at their farms and homesteads, attacks having recently been made upon them, and unoffending and defenceless women and children having fallen victims to the cruelties of those wretched people. In the atrocities recently committed by the natives, it was most painful to find they had, in several instances, manifested a desire to kill and destroy the white inhabitants whenever they had dared to attack them, and not for the purpose of plundering for food or property' (Minutes Executive Council, Colonies and Slaves, Van Diemen's Land, p. 10). The lawless convicts...and the sealers...have, from the earliest period, acted with the greatest inhumanity towards the black natives, particularly in seizing their women...; and these outrages have, it is evident, first excited, what they were naturally calculated to produce in the minds of savages, the strongest feelings of hatred and revenge. On the

116, 177, 721

other hand, it is equally apparent that the aboriginal natives of this colony are, and ever have been, a most treacherous race; that the kindness and humanity which they have always experienced from the free settlers had not tended to civilize them in any degree, nor has it induced them to forbear from the most wanton and unprovoked acts of barbarity, when a fair opportunity presented itself of indulging their disposition to maim or destroy the white inhabitants.' (Arthur, pp. 15-16)."

"In a Government Notice, mention is made of the 'series of outrages' perpetrated by the aborigines, and the 'wanton barbarity in which they have indulged by the commission of murder in return for kindness in numerous instances shown to them by the settlers and their servants' (Colonies and Slaves, Van Diemen's Land, p. 20). 'It is evident from the hostile spirit of the natives, and from the cunning which seems common to all savages, that they are not to be approached, even with a view to reconciliation, without some personal danger' (Burnet, p. 34). 'They [the natives] were sacrificed in many instances to momentary caprice or anger,... and they sustained the most unjustifiable treatment in defending themselves against outrages which it was not to be expected that any race of men should submit to without resistance, or endure without imbibing a spirit of hatred and revenge.... It is the opinion of the best-informed persons... that the former [the natives tribes] are seldom the assailants: and that when they are, they acted under [62] the impression of recent injuries done to some of them by white people.... The Committee... are, however, not prepared to say that the description given by Lieutenant-Governor Sorell of the passive and inoffensive character of the aborigines, unless when previously attacked, is entirely supported by the evidence before them... It is manifestly shown, that an intercourse with them on the part of insulated or unprotected individuals or families has never been perfectly secure. Although they might receive with apparent favour and confidence such persons as landed, from time to time, on various parts of the coast, or fell in with them in other remote situations, yet no sooner was

the store of presents exhausted, or the interview from other causes concluded, than there was a risk of the natives making an attack on those very persons from whom they had the instant before been receiving acts of kindness, and against whom they had up to that moment suffered no indication of hostility to betray itself.... These acts of violence on the part of the natives are generally to be regarded, not as retaliating for any wrongs which they conceived themselves collectively or individually to have endured, but as proceeding from a wanton and savage spirit inherent in them, and impelling them to mischief and cruelty when it appeared probable that they might be perpetrated with impunity' (Rep. Aborig. Com. pp. 36, 38)."

1: Roth--63-64 (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 181, 721

"Melville says (p. 349): 'Some of the tribes were much more ferocious than others--the greater number were remarkably quiet and tractable,' and Lloyd: 'The men... were artful to a degree, and possessed of a most unamiable and morose expression of countenance' (p. 44). Holman (IV. ch. xii. pp. 404-405) states: 'An instance of humane consideration among them is, that, in the gratification of revenge for any injury they have received, they generally spare the children of those whom they have destined to be their victims;' but on p. 425 he gives an account of a murder by some aborigines, in which no such humane consideration was shown: 'A barbarous murder was perpetrated by them... which will serve to show the savage nature of their dispositions. A settler having left his hut to perform some work at a little distance, his wife took a walk into the garden with a child in her arms, when some natives, who no doubt had watched the departure of her [64] husband, rushed forward, and instantly despatched both her and her child with a shower of spears, after which they robbed the hut and made their escape.'"

1: Roth--79
116, 411, 721

(No date) 1890

Tasmanians

"It is very remarkable that the Tasmanians, who developed in their last struggle for life and liberty such remarkable warlike powers, should originally have been armed only with the very crudest weapons. We are distinctly told that these people had neither throwing-sticks (wommeras) nor boomerangs (Jeffreys, p. 126; Breton, p. 355; Davies, p. 419; Wentworth, p. 115). According to Marion du Fresne (p. 28): 'The men were all armed with pointed sticks, and some stones which appeared to us to have cutting edges, similar to the iron one of hatchets,' while Calder (Journ. p. 21) says: 'When his [the Tasmanian's] other weapons failed him, he fought with stones, and even with these was a very formidable opponent.' One authority (Meredith, Papers Roy. Soc. Tasm. Aug. 1873) says they had no shields. But Mr. Thirkell (ibid.) says, "They used a shield made of a piece of flat wood.' Their weapons were thus limited to the spear and the waddy."

1: Roth--83 (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 619, 721

"Of their inter-tribal wars, and the causes thereof, we have necessarily only the mearest accounts. The Van Diemen's Land Annual (1834, p. 80) says: 'They were perpetually engaged in conflicts between rival tribes, and we are told that these were frequently attended by fatal issues.... Some of these tribes are infinitely more savage... than others, and more skilled in the arts of war,' and Milligan (Beacon, p. 26), 'The numerous tribes of which the population of the island consisted were constantly at war with one another.' Davis reports similarly (p. 419): 'Each tribe occupied certain tracts of country, but they were constantly invading and at war with each other.' But of course they were not always at war with each other, as Kelly's statement proves, 'The natives far to the southward and westward take no part with the natives in the interior; those on the northern and eastern coasts do not take part with the tribes in the interior' (Kelly, p. 51). According to G. Robertson (ibid. pp. 47-48), the Oyster Bay mob were exterminated by the Port Dalrymple natives. The Oyster Bay and Big River tribes were hostile to the northern natives' (ibid). Of the cause of these wars we have not far to look, the chief cause being probably the pressing presence of the Colonists,..."

1: Roth--83 [2] (No date) 1890 Tasmanians
116, 177, 619, 721

"... Melville (p. 349) states: 'Ever after the arrival of the English, they were at war with each other--tribe against tribe; and this was owing to their having been forced to trespass on each other's hunting-grounds, being driven from their own by the white population.' West, the historian, also ascribes the inter-tribal wars to this cause (II. p. 85). 'The wars among them latterly, provoked by driving one tribe on the boundaries of another, were not infrequent; as everywhere, women were the cause and object of strife .... Those [tribes] on the east of the Launceston Road were confederate. Towards the last, the Oyster Bay tribe committed their children to the care of the Big River tribe, many of whom had been slain by the Western tribes, as well as by the English.'"

1: Roth--83-84
116, 619, 721

(No date) 1890 Tasmanians

"Calder, who has gone through Robinson's voluminous reports, speaking of their internecine wars, says (Journ. pp. 24-25): 'Animosities ran high amongst them, and their quarrels never died out except with the extinction of their enemies. They made [84] long marches to surprise them; and to come on them unperceived, if possible, was their constant object. But it was most difficult to approach them thus, the greatest circumspection being necessary, for such was their vigilance, that it was rare to catch them off their guard,... There seems to have been an hereditary feud between the men of the east and the west, and whenever their captor, Robinson, met them, they were either on the march to meet their ancient enemies, or were returning from a victory; for I do not recollect a single instance in which they ever acknowledged defeat. Their march was described to me as a very regular one, and that they stepped pretty well together, singing or shouting some war-chant, and rattling their spears as they went along, striking the ground with great force with the foot every third or fourth step. The look of each was determined and ferocious beyond expression,' and on p. 27: 'The Big River and Oyster Bay tribes and the Stoney Creek tribe were the most ferocious and predatory of all the natives.'"

116, 177, 721, 609

"The first Tasmanian blood spilled by Europeans occurred during Marion du Fresne's exploring visit. His party had landed and established friendly relations with the natives. But 'when M. Marion landed, a savage detached himself from the troop, and came to present him... with a fire brand to light a little pile. The captain, thinking it was a ceremony necessary to show that he came with peaceful intentions, did not hesitate to set fire to the pile; but it soon appeared to be quite the contrary, and, that accepting the brand signified the accepting of a challenge, or declaration of war. As soon as the pile was lighted, the savages retired precipitately on to a hill, from which they threw a shower of stones, wounding M. Marion and another officer with him.... Everybody re-embarked.... The savages conveyed their women [85] and children into the woods, and followed the boats along the shore. When we wished to land, they opposed our doing so. One of them uttered a fearful cry, and immediately the whole troop discharged their pointed sticks, by which a black servant was wounded in the leg. The wound was not a great one, and the rapidity with which it healed proved that these javelins of wood were not poisoned. We replied to their shower of spears by firing, which wounded several and killed one. They fled into the woods, howling fearfully, carrying with them those who, being wounded, were unable to follow' (Marion, pp. 29-31). The next party to come to blows with them was Péron's party, and on this occasion also the encounter seems

to have been caused by a misunderstanding. He relates that, on one occasion, when they had unwittingly given offence to a large body of aborigines by one of their number being wrestled with and overthrown by a middy named Maurouard, as they were in the act of re-embarking, 'all of a sudden a long spear, thrown from behind some neighbouring rocks, struck M. Maurouard in the shoulder; this rude weapon had been thrown with such force that, after slipping along the whole surface of the shoulder-blade, it opened a passage through the flesh of the shoulder and the neck. The crew... wished to pursue the savages in vengeance, but they had already disappeared among the rocks and brushwood.... A few days afterwards, in another part of the channel [D'Entrecasteaux], there was a fresh attack, in which the savages rained a storm of pebbles down upon us; fortunately no one was hit' (Péron, ch. xii. p. 236). Another time he states: 'A short time after our return, the Commander himself came back from a short excursion which he had gone to make on the mainland [Tasmania] with Captain Hamelin, MM. Lechenault and Petit. These gentlemen had again encountered the aborigines, and the interview had again terminated in a violent attack on the part of the latter."

1: Roth--170
116, 177, 721

(No date) 1890

Tasmanians

"...when treating of war, we showed how desperately the aborigines fought for life and independence. That they should have been more successful in their struggles with Europeans than other races better provided for such struggles, was hardly to have been expected. Whatever may have been the ideas entertained on the subject by the natives, the war between the two races was considered by the colonists as one of extermination."

"Brough Smyth quotes the following from Hull, whose word we venture to think no one will doubt. Hull says: 'A friend once described to me a fearful scene at which he was present. A number of blacks, with the women and children, were congregated in a gully near town. . . and the men had formed themselves into a ring round a large fire, while the women were cooking the evening meal of opossums and bandicoots; they were surprised by [171] a party of soldiers, who, without giving warning, fired upon them as they sat, and rushing up to the scene of slaughter, found there wounded men and women, and a little child crawling near its dying mother. The soldier drove his bayonet through the body of the child, and pitchforked it into the flames. "It was only a child," he said! It is stated also,' Mr. Hull adds, 'that it was a favourite amusement to hunt the aborigines; that a day would be selected, and the neighbouring settlers invited, with their families, to a picnic. . . . After dinner, all would be gaiety and merriment, whilst the gentlemen of the party would take their guns and dogs, and, accompanied by two or three convict servants, wander through the bush in search of black fellows. Sometimes they would return without sport; at others they would succeed in killing a woman, or, if lucky, mayhap a man or two. . . . As the white settler spread his possessions over the island--over the natives' favourite camping-grounds, driving away their kangaroos and replacing them with bullocks and sheep--the natives objected in their own way to the inroad. In many

cases, no doubt, the blacks were sacrificed to momentary caprice or anger, and suffered much wrong. Indeed, one of the Governor's proclamations states, that cruelties had been perpetrated repugnant to humanity and disgraceful to the British people.'

Hull, in his MS. notes, states that one European had a pickle tub in which he put the ears of all the blacks he shot. From his account no mercy was shown on either side."

1: Roth--171
116, 177, 721

(No date) 1890

Tasmanians

"Ross, quoted by Bunce (p. 57), mentions meeting a half-starved stockman who had got "bushed" while running after a female black who had escaped the bullock-chains with which he had bound her. He adds: 'There is little doubt, indeed, but such, and even worse treatment that this, by the white stock-keepers, in the earlier periods of the colony, was the chief and original cause of the hostility which the aborigines have since indiscriminately shown to the whites.'"

1: Roth--172
116, 177, 721

(No date) 1890

Tasmanians

"But-while actual warfare and settlers' brutality were direct means towards their extermination, there were other equally powerful causes at work in wiping them off the face of the earth."